

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. In the present response, claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 are currently pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 30 are independent. Claims 2-13, 18-29, 46 and 47 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 31-33, 35-39 and 41-45 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 30, as amended. Applicants submit that pending claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**I. Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 Anticipated by Wils**

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-30, 36, 38, 39 and 42-47 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0004950 to Wils et al. (“Wils”) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit that Wils fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-30, 36, 38, 39 and 42-47.

A. Independent Claims 1 and 30 Not Anticipated By Wils

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claims 1 and 30 recite a collection agent gathering information about the client node. These claims further recite making an access control decision for a requested resource and identifying, based on the

access control decision, an application session to which the client node is permitted to connect. The application session is identified from one or more application sessions already associated with the user and disconnected from one or more client nodes previously operated by the user. Therefore, the claims explicitly indicate that the application session is identified after making the access control decision. Applicants submit that Wils fails to disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 30.

Wils describes a system for managing subscriber requests to access a system resource. Instead of identifying an application session after making an access control decision, Wils identifies an associated session (see, FIG. 2, steps 200 and 202) before making an access control decision (see, FIG. 2, step 218). Where there is no associated session, Wils creates a new session (see, FIG. 2, step 216) before making the access control decision (see, FIG. 2, step 218). Accordingly, Wils fails to disclose making an access control decision for the requested resource and identifying, based on the access control decision, an application session to which the client node is permitted to connect.

Furthermore, Wils fails to disclose a collection agent gathering information about the client node. With respect to this feature, the Examiner noted that Wils uses a subscriber key to determine what a subscriber is permitted to access. However, this subscriber key is “composed of subscriber-specific attributes gleaned from the request” (see, paragraph [0026], lines 3-5). Subscriber-specific attributes are user information, not information about a specific client node of the user. Furthermore, this information is not gathered by a collection agent in response to the request but is instead sent by the subscriber in the request itself. Therefore, Wils fails to contemplate these features of the present claims.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Wils fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1 and 30. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 30, and dependent claims 2-3, 5-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-29, 36, 38, 39 and 42-47, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-30, 36, 38, 39 and 42-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

II. Dependent Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Dependent claims 4 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Wils in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,599 to Shrader et al. (“Shrader”). Dependent claims 8, 25, 35 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Wils in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0073512 to Maung et al. (“Maung”). Dependent claims 10, 27 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Wils in view of the Examiner’s Official Notice. Claims 4, 8, 10, 25 and 27 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 31-33, 35, 37 and 41 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 30. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that Wils, Shrader and Maung, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of these claims.

A. Claims 4, 8, 10, 25, 27, 31-33, 35, 37 and 41 Patentable over Wils, Shrader and Maung

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. For the reasons discussed above in connection with the rejection of the independent claims 1 and 30, Applicants submit independent claims 1 and 30

are patentable and in condition for allowance. Thus, claims 4, 8, 10, 25, 27, 31-33, 35, 37 and 41, dependent from claims 1 and 30, are patentable and in condition for allowance.

As described above in connection with claims 1 and 30, Wils fails to disclose gathering, by a collection agent, information about the client node, making an access control decision for the requested resource and identifying, based on the access control decision, an application session to which the client node is permitted to connect. The Examiner cites Maung only for a session storage feature. The Examiner further cites Shrader only for a client-side script feature. Neither reference teaches or suggests gathering, by a collection agent, information about the client node, making an access control decision for the requested resource and identifying, based on the access control decision, an application session to which the client node is permitted to connect. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination of Wils, Shrader and Maung fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned features of claims 4, 8, 10, 25, 27, 31-33, 35, 37 and 41.

Since Wils, Shrader and Maung, alone or in combination, fail to detract from the patentability of the independent claims, Applicants submit that dependent claims 4, 8, 10, 25, 27, 31-33, 35, 37 and 41 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 4, 8, 10, 25, 27, 31-33, 35, 37 and 41 under U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: July 17, 2009

/John D. Lanza/

John D. Lanza

Registration No. 40,060

Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP

Two International Place

Boston, MA 02110

(617) 248-5000